

1  
2  
3 JS-6  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

DANNA VONGAMATH,

Plaintiff,

v.

SHARVANIAN LAW FIRM et al.,

Defendants.

No. ED CV 22-01954-VBF-ADS

**ORDER**

Dismissing Action Without Prejudice  
for Lack of Prosecution, Failure to  
Comply with Court Order & Failure  
to Pay the Case-Filing Fee

On November 3, 2022, proceeding pro se, plaintiff Danna Vongamath constructively filed the complaint initiating this 42 U.S.C. section 1983 civil-rights action on behalf of himself and his son, listed in the caption as A.I.L. *See* CM/ECF System Document (“Doc”) 1. On November 7, 2022, the Clerk’s Office issued a Form CV-93 Notice re: Discrepancies in Filing of Civil Rights Complaint (Doc 3), advising plaintiff that he had not paid the appropriate filing fee. The Notice further advised plaintiff that he had thirty days to either pay the filing fee or file a Form CV-60 Request to Proceed Without Prepayment of Filing Fees with Declaration in Support. Finally, the Notice warned plaintiff that if he did not respond within thirty days from the date of the Notice, “your action may be dismissed.”

Not counting the day that the Notice was issued (November 7, 2022), the thirty days started running on November 8, 2022 and ended at midnight on December 7, 2022. That

1 deadline elapsed well over a month ago, yet plaintiff has neither paid the case filing fee nor  
2 submitted a Form CV-60 request to proceed without prepayment.

3 Instead, plaintiff mailed a letter to the Court, which was docketed on December 15,  
4 202 (Doc 4). The letter contained often disjointed, incoherent, or unclear allegations against  
5 Sharvanian Law Firm and apparently local police for stalking and harassing him, and he  
6 requests injunctive relief against the Sharvanian Law Firm “and all Sharvanians.”

7 On page two of the letter, plaintiff refers without explanation to “a bomb going off”  
8 and states that he needs a background check, perhaps on the mayor of Eastvale, California.  
9 *See Doc 4 at 3.* Plaintiff then alleges that Sharvanian Law Firm “had the fire department on  
10 pay” and observes, without explanation, “PS Money also for hire.” Doc 4 at 2-3. Plaintiff  
11 next alleges that the CHP and the “Riverside Norco Sheriff’s Department” grow marijuana  
12 and watch “mafia” growing marijuana. He states, “I used to work for them growing weed,  
13 and they told me they were paying the Sheriff’s Department”, and charges that “they are  
14 premedit[ ]ating to kill me walking home from jail.” Doc 4 at 3. He fails to make clear  
15 whether “they” are the Sharvanians, Sheriff’s Department, CHP, or someone else.

16 Plaintiff concludes the letter by requesting “a gen[e]ral pardon” for unspecified  
17 putative convictions or illegal conduct “to protect myself and my family”, alleging that an  
18 unspecified “they alre[a]dy killed my fat[h]er’s family - and his children.” Doc 4 at 5.

19 **Accordingly, this action is dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution,  
20 failure to comply with court order, and failure to pay the case filing fee.**

21 **Plaintiff is also advised that the Local Civil Rules of the United States District  
22 Court for the Central District of California prohibit letters to the judges.**

23 **The case shall be terminated (JS-6). IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: January 18, 2023

*Valerie Baker Fairbank*

27 Honorable Valerie Baker Fairbank  
28 Senior United States District Judge